



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/732,837	12/07/2000	John T. Austin	PD-990309	2999

7590 03/08/2007
Hughes Electronic Corporation
Corporate Patents & Licensing
P.O. Box 956
R11, Mail Station A109
El Sagundo, CA 90245-0956

EXAMINER

PHAN, HANH

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2613

SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
3 MONTHS	03/08/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

5

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/732,837

Applicant(s)

AUSTIN, JOHN T.

Examiner

Hanh Phan

Art Unit

2613

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 26 January 2007.
 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-19 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-19 is/are rejected.
 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
 1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
 * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This Office Action is responsive to the RCE filed on 01/26/2007.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

2. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

3. Claims 1-3, 10, 18 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

-Claim 1 recites the limitation "**the Internet**" in line 5. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

-Claim 2 recites the limitation "**the Ka band**" in line 2. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

-Claim 10 recites the limitation "**the Internet**" in line 2. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

-Claim 18 recites the limitation "**the second teleport station**" in line 2. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

-Claim 19 recites the limitation "**the second teleport station**" in line 2. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 1, 3, 5, 8-10 and 13-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Adiwoso et al. (US Patent No. 6,067,453) in view of Schiff et al (US Patent No. 6,233,456).

Regarding claims 1 and 9, referring to Figure 1, Adiwoso et al. teaches a communications system comprising:

a first teleport station (i.e., gateway station 30, Fig. 1, col. 4, lines 6-67 and col. 5, lines 1-5);

a first user terminal (i.e., user terminal 20a, Fig. 1, col. 4, lines 6-67 and col. 5, lines 1-5);

a satellite (i.e., satellite 12, Fig. 1) coupling the first teleport station (30, Fig. 1) to the first user terminal (20a, Fig. 1, col. 4, lines 6-67 and col. 5, lines 1-5); and

a network access point (i.e., Internet access point IAP 37, Fig. 1) directly coupled to the Internet and directly coupled to the first teleport station (i.e., gateway station 30, Fig. 1) through a connection (i.e., Fig. 1, col. 4, lines 6-67 and col. 5, lines 1-5).

Adiwoso et al. differs from claims 1 and 9 in that he fails to specifically teach the network access point directly coupled to the first teleport station through an optical fiber. Schiff et al, from the same field of endeavor, likewise teaches a mobile satellite network

Art Unit: 2613

(Figure 1). Schiff et al further teaches the network access point (i.e., command center MTSO and PSTN, Fig. 1) directly coupled to the first teleport station (i.e., gateway 120, Fig. 1) through an optical fiber (i.e., optical fiber 162, Fig. 1, col. 8, lines 50-67 and col. 9, lines 1-12). Based on this teaching, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the network access point directly coupled to the first teleport station through an optical fiber as taught by Schiff et al in the system of Adiwoso et al. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do this since allowing providing a high speed broadband interface to services.

Regarding claim 3, the combination of Adiwoso et al and Schiff et al teaches further comprising a second teleport station coupled to the first teleport station through the satellite (i.e., Fig. 1 of Adiwoso et al and Fig. 1 of Schiff et al).

Regarding claim 5, Adiwoso et al teaches all the aspects of the claimed invention as set forth in the rejection to claim 1 above except fails to specifically teach routing the communication from the first teleport station to the second teleport station by way of an optical fiber network. However, Schiff et al teaches routing the communication from the first teleport station to the second teleport station by way of an optical fiber network (i.e., Fig. 1, col. 8, lines 50-67 and col. 9, lines 1-12). Based on this teaching, it would have been obvious to one having skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the routing the communication from the first teleport station to the second teleport station by way of an optical fiber network as taught by Schiff et al in the system of Adiwoso et al. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do this

Art Unit: 2613

since allowing providing an optical communication system with high speed and high capacity.

Regarding claim 8, Adiwoso et al further teaches coupling the first teleport station to the internet (i.e., Fig. 1 of Adiwoso et al).

Regarding claim 10, the combination of Adiwoso et al and Schiff et al teaches connecting the optical communication network to the internet (i.e., Fig. 1 of Adiwoso et al and Fig. 1 of Schiff et al, col. 8, lines 50-67 and col. 9, lines 1-12).

Regarding claim 13, the combination of Adiwoso et al and Schiff et al teaches wherein directing a communication from a first of said plurality of teleport stations through said satellite comprises directing the communication from the first of said plurality of teleport stations through said satellite to a first user terminal (i.e., Fig. 1 of Adiwoso et al and Fig. 1 of Schiff et al).

Regarding claims 14 and 15, the combination of Adiwoso et al and Schiff et al teaches wherein directing a communication from a first of said plurality of teleport stations through said satellite comprises directing the communication from the first of said plurality of teleport stations through said satellite to a first user terminal through a third teleport station (i.e., Fig. 1 of Adiwoso et al and Fig. 1 of Schiff et al).

Regarding claims 16 and 18, the combination of Adiwoso et al and Schiff et al teaches directing the communication from the second teleport station to a first user terminal through an optical fiber Fig. 1 of Schiff et al, col. 8, lines 50-67 and col. 9, lines 1-12

Art Unit: 2613

Regarding claims 17 and 19, the combination of Adiwoso et al and Schiff et al teaches directing the communication from the second teleport station to a first user terminal through a second satellite (i.e., Fig. 1 of Adiwoso et al and Fig. 1 of Schiff et al).

6. Claims 2, 6, 7, 11 and 12 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Adiwoso et al. (US Patent No. 6,067,453) in view of Schiff et al (US Patent No. 6,233,456) and further in view of Wiedeman (US Patent No. 5,896,558).

Regarding claim 2, the combination of Adiwoso et al and Schiff et al differs from claim 2 in that it fails to specifically teach wherein the satellite comprises a satellite in the Ka band. Weideman, from the same filed of endeavor, likewise teaches mobile satellite network (Fig. 1). Weideman further teaches the satellite comprises a satellite in the Ka band (i.e., Figs. 1, 5 and 6 of Wiedeman, col. 4, lines 52-63, col. 5, lines 65-67, col. 6, lines 1-30 and col. 7, lines 30-60). Based on this teaching, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the satellite comprises a satellite in the Ka band as taught by Weideman in the system of the combination of Adiwoso et al and Schiff et al. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do this since allowing providing a satellite network with high speed and high capacity.

Regarding claim 6, the combination of Adiwoso et al, Schiff et al and Wiedeman teaches routing the communication from the second teleport station to the second user terminal by way of an optical fiber (i.e., Fig. 1 of Weideman, col. 4, lines 52-63, col. 5, lines 65-67, col. 6, lines 1-30 and col. 7, lines 30-60).

Regarding claim 7, the combination of Adiwoso et al, Schiff et al and Wiedeman teaches routing the communication from the second teleport station to the second user terminal by way of a second satellite (i.e., Fig. 1 of Weideman, col. 4, lines 52-63, col. 5, lines 65-67, col. 6, lines 1-30 and col. 7, lines 30-60).

Regarding claim 11, the combination of Adiwoso et al, Schiff et al and Wiedeman teaches wherein the plurality of beams are non-coextensive (i.e., Fig. 1 of Adiwoso et al and Fig. 1 of Weideman).

Regarding claim 12, the combination of Adiwoso et al, Schiff et al and Wiedeman teaches wherein the plurality of beams reuse the same frequency (Fig. 1 of Weideman).

7. Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over unpatentable over Adiwoso et al. (US Patent No. 6,067,453) in view of Schiff et al (US Patent No. 6,233,456) and further in view of Acampora (US Patent No. 6,049,593).

Regarding claim 4, the combination the combination of Adiwoso et al and Schiff et al teaches all the aspects of the claimed invention as set forth in the rejection to claim 1 above except fails to teach routing the communication from the first teleport station to the second teleport station through the satellite when the an irregularity is detected in the optical fiber. However, Acampora in US Patent No. 6,049,593 teaches the data signal is routed from the optical portion (i.e., optical link or optical fiber) to the radio portion (i.e., microwave radio link) when the optical link portion is failed (i.e., col. 27, lines 37-67). Based on this teaching, it would have been obvious to one having skill in

Art Unit: 2613

the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the routing the communication from the first teleport station to the second teleport station through the radio frequency system (RF system) when the an irregularity is detected in the optical fiber as taught by Acampora in the system of the combination of Adiwoso et al and Schiff et al. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do this since allowing providing for reliability in bad conditions of the fiber transmission line between the two stations such as the fiber is failure or break.

Response to Arguments

8. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-10 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Hanh Phan whose telephone number is (571)272-3035.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jason Chan, can be reached on (571)272-3022. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571)273-8300.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703)305-4700.


HANH PHAN
PRIMARY EXAMINER